



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,175	10/23/2003	Kim Cameron	40062.0219US01	2599
27488	7590	11/16/2004	EXAMINER	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C. P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			LEWIS, CHERYL RENEA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2167		

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/693,175	CAMERON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Cheryl Lewis	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/10/04</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

2. The information disclosure statements received on April 5, 2004, complies with the provisions of MPEP § 609. They have been placed in the application file, and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

***Claim Objections***

3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).
4. Applicants have misnumbered claims 1-36. The claims comprise two claims that are numbered claim 26. The claims must be renumbered claims 1-39. Independent Claim 26 should be renumbered claim 29. Also, the claim number dependency for the dependent claims must be renumbered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6, 8-28, and 30-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boothby (Pat. No. 6,799,190 B1 filed April 11, 2002); Prasad et al. (Pat. No. 6,539,381 B1 filed April 21, 1999, hereinafter Prasad); and Jolissaint et al. (Pat. No. 6,463,149 B1 filed September 15, 1995, hereinafter Jolissaint).

7. Regarding Claims 1, 15, 22, (independent claim) 26, 31, and 35, Boothby teaches synchronizing databases.

The method and associated system for synchronizing databases as taught or suggested by Boothby includes:

connecting the primary computer and the secondary computer system to provide communication capability between the primary computer system and the secondary computer system (col. 7, lines 49-63); determining new identity information exists on the primary computer system and that a synchronization operation should be performed (col. 2, lines 1-32); converting the new identity information into a different format (col. 12, lines 40-60, col. 13, lines 51-65, col. 14, lines 1-37, col. 16, lines 25-62), the different format associated with the secondary computer system (col. 12, lines 40-60, col. 13, lines 51-65, col. 14, lines 1-37, col. 16, lines 25-62); propagating the converted information to the secondary computer system (col. 4, lines 35-44, col. 9, lines 1-16 and

28-40); a control module (figure 2, element 2, col. 8, lines 35-38); and a synchronization module (figure 2, element 15, col. 8, lines 52-65).

However, Boothby does not expressly teach converting new information.

Prasad teaches converting new information (col. 17, lines 30-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the synchronization method of Boothby with the synchronization method of Prasad because Prasad's synchronization method enables a data server to convert replica data to a subordinate data reference means, wherein the data reference represents significant changes in data that has been replicated from the original server (see Prasad, col. 17, lines 20-43).

Prasad does not expressly teach a synchronization interface.

Jolissaint teaches a synchronization interface (col. 5, lines 45-67, col. 6, lines 1-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the synchronization method of Prasad with the synchronization method of Jolissaint because Jolissaint's method enables web page synchronization for a computer telephone system allowing live agent interaction, an update of data to an electronic workplace, and automated responses to received telephone calls (see Jolissaint, col. 4, lines 30-40).

8. Regarding Claims 2 and 16, Boothby teaches an operating system
9. Regarding Claims 3 and 17, the limitations of these claims has been noted in the rejections of claims 1 and 15 above. In addition, Boothby teaches the secondary

computer system has a representative database of identity information (col. 2, lines 1-7), wherein the representative database is representative of a primary database of identity information stored on the primary computer system (col. 7, lines 50-63, col. 8, lines 6-20).

10. Regarding Claim 4, Boothby teaches the secondary computer system has less identity information than the primary database (col. 12, lines 40-60, col. 13, lines 51-65, col. 14, lines 1-37, col. 16, lines 25-62).

11. Regarding Claims 5, and (second dependent claim no.) 27, Jolissaint teaches a telephone system and the identity information comprises contact information (col. 3, lines 53-67, col. 4, lines 1-7, col. 6, lines 50-61).

12. Regarding Claim 6, (second dependent claim no.) 28, Boothby teaches a handheld personal digital assistant computer system (col. 7, lines 50-57).

13. Regarding Claim 8 and 9, Boothby teaches the new identity information is entered (col. 4, lines 44-53).

14. Regarding Claims 10, 11, 18, 30, 36, the limitations of this claim has been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 15, and 35 above. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

15. Regarding Claims 12 and 19, the limitations of this claim has been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 15 above. In addition, Boothby teaches the mapping table (figure 2, elements 3 and 4).

16. Regarding Claims 13, 14, 20, 21, 27, and 28, Boothby teaches embodying a program of executable instructions (col. 4, lines 45-61).

17. Regarding Claims 23-26 (dependent claim 26), 33, 34, the limitations of these claims has been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 15, and 22 above. In addition, Prasad teaches a third format associated with a third computer system (col. 17, lines 30-43).

18. Regarding Claim 32, Jolissaint teaches a user interface (col. 4, lines 14-30).

19. Claims 7 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boothby (Pat. No. 6,799,190 B1 filed April 11, 2002); Prasad et al. (Pat. No. 6,539,381 B1 filed April 21, 1999, hereinafter Prasad); and Jolissaint et al. (Pat. No. 6,463,149 B1 filed September 15, 1995, hereinafter Jolissaint) as applied to claims 1 and (independent claim) 26 above, and further in view of Robertson (Pat. No. 6,269,369 B1 filed November 7, 1997, hereinafter Robertson).

20. Regarding Claims 7 and 29, Boothby, Prasad, and Jolissaint do not expressly teach an email account system.

Robertson teaches an email account system (Abstract, lines 4-11, col. 5, line 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the synchronization methods of Boothby, Prasad, and Jolissaint with the synchronization method of Robertson because Robertson's synchronization method enables data of a personal digital assistant to be synchronized with a server database, wherein PIM (personal information management) software stored on the user computer performs a synchronization process to update data provided by the server database (see Robertson, col. 15, lines 65-66, col. 16, lines 1-15).

**NAME OF CONTACT**

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Lewis whose telephone number is (571) 272-4113. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 or (703) 305-9731.

(571) 273-4113 (Use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper/amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions.).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/ Technology Center's new number will be (571) 272-2100.



Cheryl Lewis  
Patent Examiner  
November 10, 2004